arXiv:1704.00191v1 [math.RA] 1 Apr 2017

ON (σ, δ)-SKEW MCCOY MODULES

MOHAMED LOUZARI AND L'MOUFADAL BEN YAKOUB

Abstract. Let (σ, δ) be a quasi derivation of a ring R and M_R a right R-module. In this paper, we introduce the notion of (σ, δ)-skew McCoy modules which extends the notion of McCoy modules and σ-skew McCoy modules. This concept can be regarded also as a generalization of (σ, δ)-skew Armendariz modules. Some properties of this concept are established and some connections between (σ, δ)-skew McCoyness and (σ, δ)-compatible reduced modules are examined. Also, we study the property (σ, δ)-skew McCoy of some skew triangular matrix extensions $V_n(M, \sigma)$, for any nonnegative integer $n \geq 2$. As a consequence, we obtain: (1) M_R is (σ, δ)-skew McCoy if and only if $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $(\overline{\sigma}, \overline{\delta})$-skew McCoy, and (2) M_R is σ-skew McCoy if and only if $M[x; \sigma]/M[x; \sigma](x^n)$ is $\overline{\sigma}$-skew McCoy.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, R denotes an associative ring with unity and M_R a right R-module. For a subset X of a module M_R, $r_R(X) = \{a \in R | Xa = 0\}$ and $\ell_R(X) = \{a \in R | aX = 0\}$ will stand for the right and the left annihilator of X in R respectively. An Ore extension of a ring R is denoted by $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$, where σ is an endomorphism of R and δ is a σ-derivation, i.e., $\delta \colon R \to R$ is an additive map such that $\delta(ab) = \sigma(a)\delta(b) + \delta(a)b$ for all $a, b \in R$ (the pair (σ, δ) is also called a quasi-derivation of R). Recall that elements of $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ are polynomials in x with coefficients written on the left. Multiplication in $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is given by the multiplication in R and the condition $xa = \sigma(a)x + \delta(a)$, for all $a \in R$. In the next, S will stand for the Ore extension $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$. On the other hand, we have a natural functor $- \otimes_R S$ from the category of right R-modules into the category of right S-modules. For a right R-module M, the right S-module $M \otimes_R S$ is called *the induced module* [16]. Since $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is a free left R-module, elements of $M \otimes_R S$ can be seen as polynomials in x with coefficients in M with natural addition and right S-module multiplication.

For any $0 \leq i \leq j$ $(i, j \in \mathbb{N})$, $f_i^j \in End(R, +)$ will denote the map which is the sum of all possible words in σ, δ built with i factors of σ and $j - i$ factors of δ (e.g., $f_n^n = \sigma^n$ and $f_0^n = \delta^n, n \in \mathbb{N}$). We have $x^j a = \sum_{i=0}^{j} f_i^j(a) x^i$ for

Date: April 4, 2017.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16S36, 16U80.

Key words and phrases. McCoy module, (σ, δ)-skew McCoy module, semicommutative module, Armendariz module, (σ, δ)-skew Armendariz module, reduced module.

all $a \in R$, where i, j are nonnegative integers with $j \geq i$ (see [14, Lemma 4.1]).

Following Lee and Zhou [15], we introduce the notation $M[x; \sigma, \delta]$ to write the S-module $M \otimes_R S$. Consider

$$M[x; \sigma, \delta] := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n} m_i x^i \mid n \geq 0, m_i \in M \right\};$$

which is an S-module under an obvious addition and the action of monomials of $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ on monomials in $M[x; \sigma, \delta]_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}$ via $(mx^j)(ax^\ell) = m \sum_{i=0}^{j} f_i^j(a) x^{i+\ell}$ for all $a \in R$ and $j, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$. The S-module $M[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is called the *skew polynomial extension* related to the quasi-derivation (σ, δ).

A module M_R is semicommutative, if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ implies $mRa = 0$ [6]. Let σ an endomorphism of R, M_R is called an σ-semicommutative module [17] if, for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ implies $mR\sigma(a) = 0$. For a module M_R and a quasi-derivation (σ, δ) of R, we say that M_R is σ-compatible, if for each $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, we have $ma = 0 \Leftrightarrow m\sigma(a) = 0$. Moreover, we say that M_R is δ-compatible, if for each $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, we have $ma = 0 \Rightarrow m\delta(a)=0$. If M_R is both σ-compatible and δ-compatible, we say that M_R is (σ, δ)-compatible (see [3]). In [17], a module M_R is called *σ-skew Armendariz*, if $m(x)f(x) = 0$ where $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} m_i x^i \in M[x; \sigma]$ and $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j x^j \in R[x; \sigma]$ implies $m_i \sigma^i(a_j) = 0$ for all i, j. According to Lee and Zhou [15], M_R is called *σ-Armendariz*, if it is σ-compatible and σ-skew Armendariz.

Following Alhevas and Moussavi [1], a module M_R is called (σ, δ)-skew Armendariz, if whenever $m(x)g(x) = 0$ where $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x; \sigma, \delta]$ and $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} b_j x^j \in R[x; \sigma, \delta]$, we have $m_i x^i b_j x^j = 0$ for all i, j.

In this paper, we introduce the concept of (σ, δ)-skew McCoy modules which is a generalization of McCoy modules and σ-skew McCoy modules. This concept can be regarded also as a generalization of (σ, δ)-skew Armendariz modules and rings. We study connections between reduced modules, (σ, δ)-compatible modules and (σ, δ)-skew McCoy modules. Also, we show that (σ, δ)-skew McCoyness passes from a module M_R to its skew triangular matrix extension $V_n(M, \sigma)$. In this sens, we complete the definition of skew triangular matrix rings $V_n(R, \sigma)$ given by Isfahani [12], by introducing the notion of skew triangular matrix modules. Moreover, we give some results on (σ, δ)-skew McCoyness for skew triangular matrix modules.

2. (σ, δ)-skew McCoy modules

Cui and Chen [7, 8], introduced both concepts of McCoy modules and σ-skew McCoy modules. A module M_R is called *McCoy* if $m(x)g(x) = 0$, where $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x]$ and $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} b_j x^j \in R[x] \setminus \{0\}$ implies that there exists $a \in R \setminus \{0\}$ such that $m(x)a = 0$. A module M_R is called *σ-skew McCoy* if $m(x)g(x) = 0$, where $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x; \sigma]$ and $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} b_j x^j \in R[x; \sigma] \setminus \{0\}$ implies that there exists $a \in R \setminus \{0\}$ such

that $m(x)a = 0$. With the same manner, we introduce the concept of (σ,δ)-*skew McCoy* modules which is a generalization of McCoy modules, σ-skew McCoy modules and (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz modules.

Definition 2.1. *Let M_R be a module and $M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ the corresponding (σ,δ)-skew polynomial module over $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$.*

(**1**) *The module M_R is called (σ,δ)-skew McCoy if $m(x)g(x) = 0$, where $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} b_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta] \setminus \{0\}$, implies that there exists $a \in R\setminus\{0\}$ such that $m(x)a = 0$ (i.e., $\sum_{i=\ell}^{p} m_i f_\ell^i(a) = 0$, for all $\ell = 0, 1, \cdots, p$).*

(**2**) *The ring R is called (σ,δ)-skew McCoy if R is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy as a right R-module.*

Remark 2.2. (**1**) *If M_R is an (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz module then it is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy (Proposition 2.4). But the converse is not true (Example 2.5).*

(**2**) *If $\sigma = id_R$ and $\delta = 0$ we get the concept of McCoy module, if only $\delta = 0$, we get the concept of σ-skew McCoy module.*

(**3**) *A module M_R is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy if and only if for all $m(x) \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$, $r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(m(x)) \neq 0 \Rightarrow r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(m(x)) \cap R \neq 0$.*

An ideal I of a ring R is called (σ,δ)-stable, if $\sigma(I) \subseteq I$ and $\delta(I) \subseteq I$.

Proposition 2.3. (**1**) *Let I be a nonzero right ideal of R. If I is (σ,δ)-stable then R/I is an R-module (σ,δ)-skew McCoy.*

(**2**) *For any index set I, if M_i is an (σ_i,δ_i)-skew McCoy as R_i-module for each $i \in I$, then $\prod_{i\in I} M_i$ is an (σ,δ)-skew McCoy as $\prod_{i\in I} R_i$-module, where $(\sigma,\delta) = (\sigma_i,\delta_i)_{i\in I}$.*

(**3**) *Every submodule of an (σ,δ)-skew McCoy module is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy. In particular, if I is a right ideal of an (σ,δ)-skew McCoy ring then I_R is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy module.*

(**4**) *A module M_R is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy if and only if every finitely generated submodule of M_R is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy.*

Proof. (**1**) Let $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} \overline{m}_i x^i \in (R/I)[x;\sigma,\delta]$, where $\overline{m}_i = r_i + I \in R/I$ for all $i = 0, 1, \cdots, p$ and r an arbitrary nonzero element of I. We have $m(x)r = \sum_{i=0}^{p}(r_i + I)\sum_{\ell=0}^{i} f_\ell^i(r)x^\ell \in I[x;\sigma,\delta]$, because $f_\ell^i(r) \in I$ for all $\ell = 0, 1, \cdots, i$. Hence $m(x)r = \bar{0}$.

(**2**) Let $M = \prod_{i\in I} M_i$ and $R = \prod_{i\in I} R_i$ such that each M_i is an (σ_i,δ_i)-skew McCoy as R_i-module for all $i \in I$. Take $m(x) = (m_i(x))_{i\in I} \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x) = (f_i(x))_{i\in I} \in R[x;\sigma,\delta] \setminus \{0\}$, where $m_i(x) = \sum_{s=0}^{p} m_i(s)x^s \in M_i[x;\sigma_i,\delta_i]$ and $f_i(x) = \sum_{t=0}^{q} a_i(t)x^t \in R_i[x;\sigma_i,\delta_i]$ for each $i \in I$. Suppose that $m(x)f(x) = 0$, then $m_i(x)f_i(x) = 0$ for each $i \in I$. Since M_i is (σ_i,δ_i)-skew McCoy, there exists $0 \neq r_i \in R_i$ such that $m_i(x)r_i = 0$ for each $i \in I$. Thus $m(x)r = 0$ where $0 \neq r = (r_i)_{i\in I} \in R$.

(**3**) and (4) are obvious. □

Proposition 2.4. *If M_R is an (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz module then it is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy.*

Proof. Let $m(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $g(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{q} b_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]\setminus\{0\}$. Suppose that $m(x)g(x)=0$, then $m_i x^i b_j x^j = 0$ for all i,j. Since $g(x)\neq 0$ then $b_{j_0}\neq 0$ for some $j_0\in\{0,1,\cdots,p\}$. Thus $m_i x^i b_{j_0} x^{j_0}=0$ for all i. On the other hand $m_i x^i b_{j_0} x^{j_0} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p}(\sum_{i=\ell}^{p} m_i f_\ell^i(b_{j_0}))x^{\ell+j_0}=0$, and so $\sum_{i=\ell}^{p} m_i f_\ell^i(b_{j_0})=0$ for all $\ell=0,1,\cdots,p$. Thus $m(x)b_{j_0}=0$, therefore M_R is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy. □

By the next example, we see that the converse of Proposition 2.4 does not hold.

Example 2.5. *Let R be a reduced ring. Consider the ring*

$$R_4=\left\{\begin{pmatrix} a & a_{12} & a_{13} & a_{14}\\ 0 & a & a_{23} & a_{24}\\ 0 & 0 & a & a_{34}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a\end{pmatrix} \mid a,a_{ij}\in R\right\},$$

Since R is reduced then it is right McCoy and so R_4 is right McCoy, by [18, Proposition 2.1]. *But R_4 is not Armendariz by* [13, Example 3].

A module (σ,δ)-skew McCoy need not to be McCoy by [8, Example 2.3(2)]. Also, the following example shows that, there exists a module which is McCoy but not (σ,δ)-skew McCoy.

Example 2.6. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_2$ be the ring of integers modulo 2, and consider the ring $R=\mathbb{Z}_2\oplus\mathbb{Z}_2$ with the usual addition and multiplication. Let σ be an endomorphism of R defined by $\sigma((a,b))=(b,a)$ and δ an σ-derivation of R defined by $\delta((a,b))=(a,b)-\sigma((a,b))$. The ring R is commutative reduced then it is McCoy. However, for $p(x)=(1,0)x$ and $q(x)=(1,1)+(1,0)x\in R[x;\sigma,\delta]$. We have $p(x)q(x)=0$, but $p(x)(a,b)\neq 0$ for any $0\neq(a,b)\in R$. Therefore, R is not (σ,δ)-skew McCoy. Also, R is not (σ,δ)-compatible, because $(0,1)(1,0)=(0,0)$, but $(0,1)\sigma((1,0))=(0,1)^2\neq(0,0)$ and $(0,1)\delta((1,0))=(0,1)(1,1)=(0,1)\neq(0,0)$.*

Lemma 2.7. *Let M_R be an (σ,δ)-compatible module. For any $m\in M_R$, $a\in R$ and nonnegative integers i,j. We have the following:*

(**1**) *$ma=0\Rightarrow m\sigma^i(a)=m\delta^j(a)=0$.*

(**2**) *$ma=0\Rightarrow m\sigma^i(\delta^j(a))=m\delta^i(\sigma^j(a))=0$.*

Proof. The verification is straightforward. □

If M_R is an (σ,δ)-compatible module then $ma=0\Rightarrow mf_i^j(a)=0$ for any nonnegative integers i,j such that $i\geq j$, where $m\in M_R$ and $a\in R$. For a subset U of M_R and (σ,δ) a quasi-derivation of R, the set of all skew polynomials with coefficients in U is denoted by $U[x;\sigma,\delta]$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let M_R be a module and (σ,δ) a quasi-derivation of R. The following are equivalent:*

(**1**) *For any $U \subseteq M[x;\sigma,\delta]$, $(r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(U) \cap R)[x;\sigma,\delta] = r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(U)$.*

(**2**) *For any $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]$. If $m(x)f(x) = 0$ implies $\sum_{\ell=i}^{p} m_\ell f_i^\ell(a_j) = 0$ for all i,j.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Let $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]$. If $m(x)f(x) = 0$, we have $f(x) \in r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(m(x)) = (r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(m(x)) \cap R)[x;\sigma,\delta]$. Then $a_j \in r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(m(x))$ for all j, so that $m(x)a_j = 0$ for all j. But $m(x)a_j = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\ell=i}^{p} m_\ell f_i^\ell(a_j) = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq p$. Thus $\sum_{\ell=i}^{p} m_\ell f_i^\ell(a_j) = 0$ for all i,j.
(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let $U \subseteq M[x;\sigma,\delta]$, we have always $(r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(U) \cap R)[x;\sigma,\delta] \subseteq r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(U)$. Conversely, let $f(x) \in r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(U)$ then by (2), we have $Ua_j = 0$ for all j and so $a_j \in r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(U) \cap R$. Therefore $f(x) \in (r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(U) \cap R)[x;\sigma,\delta]$. □

Theorem 2.9 (McCoy's Theorem for module extensions)**.** *Let M_R be a module and N a nonzero submodule of $M[x;\sigma,\delta]$. If one of the equivalent conditions of Lemma 2.8 is satisfied. Then $r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(N) \neq 0$ implies $r_R(N) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(N) \neq 0$, then there exists $0 \neq f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} a_i x^i \in r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(N)$. But $r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(N) = (r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(N) \cap R)[x;\sigma,\delta]$ by Lemma 2.8. Therefore all a_i are in $r_{R[x;\sigma,\delta]}(N)$, so $a_i \in r_R(N)$ for all i. Since $f(x) \neq 0$ then there exists $i_0 \in \{0,1,\cdots p\}$ such that $0 \neq a_{i_0} \in r_R(N)$. So that $r_R(N) \neq 0$. □

Definition 2.10. *Let M_R be a module and σ an endomorphism of R. We say that M_R satisfies the condition $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$ if whenever $m\sigma(a) = 0$ with $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, then $ma = 0$.*

Proposition 2.11. *Let $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ such that $m(x)f(x) = 0$. If one of the following conditions hold:*

(**a**) *M_R is (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz and satisfy the condition $(\mathcal{C}_\sigma)$.*

(**b**) *M_R is reduced and (σ,δ)-compatible. Then $m_i a_j = 0$ for all i,j.*

Proof. (**a**) Since M_R is (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz then from $m(x)f(x) = 0$, we get $m_i x^i a_j x^j = 0$ for all i,j. But $m_i x^i a_j x^j = m_i \sum_{\ell=0}^{i} f_\ell^i(a_j) x^{j+\ell} = m_i \sigma^i(a_j) x^{i+j} + Q(x) = 0$ where $Q(x)$ is a polynomial in $M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ of degree strictly less than $i+j$. Thus $m_i\sigma^i(a_j) = 0$, therefore $m_i a_j = 0$ for all i,j.

(**b**) We will use freely the fact that, if $ma = 0$ then $m\sigma^i(a) = m\delta^j(a) = mf_i^j(a) = 0$ for any nonnegative integers i,j with $j \geq i$. From $m(x)f(x) = 0$, we have the following system of equations:

$$m_p\sigma^p(a_q) = 0, \tag{0}$$

$$m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-1}) + m_{p-1}\sigma^{p-1}(a_q) + m_p f_{p-1}^p(a_q) = 0, \tag{1}$$

(2)
$$m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-2})+m_{p-1}\sigma^{p-1}(a_{q-1})+m_pf^p_{p-1}(a_{q-1})+m_{p-2}\sigma^{p-2}(a_q)+m_{p-1}f^{p-1}_{p-2}(a_q) +m_pf^p_{p-2}(a_q)=0,$$

(3) $$m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-3})+m_{p-1}\sigma^{p-1}(a_{q-2})+m_pf^p_{p-1}(a_{q-2})+m_{p-2}\sigma^{p-2}(a_{q-1}) +m_{p-1}f^{p-1}_{p-2}(a_{q-1})+m_pf^p_{p-2}(a_{q-1})+m_{p-3}\sigma^{p-3}(a_q)+m_{p-2}f^{p-2}_{p-3}(a_q) +m_{p-1}f^{p-1}_{p-3}(a_q)+m_pf^p_{p-3}(a_q)=0,$$

$$\vdots$$

(ℓ) $$\sum_{j+k=\ell}\sum_{i=0}^{p}\sum_{k=0}^{q}(m_i\sum_{j=0}^{i}f^i_j(a_k))=0,$$

$$\vdots$$

$(p+q)$ $$\sum_{i=0}^{p}m_i\delta^i(a_0)=0.$$

From equation (0), we have $m_pa_q=0$ by σ-compatibility. Multiplying equation (1) on the right hand by a_q, we get

(1′)
$$m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-1})a_q+m_{p-1}\sigma^{p-1}(a_q)a_q+m_pf^p_{p-1}(a_q)a_q=0,$$

Since M_R is semicommutative, then

$$m_pa_q=0\Rightarrow m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-1})a_q=m_pf^p_{p-1}(a_q)a_q=0.$$

By Lemma 2.12, equation (1′) gives $m_{p-1}a_q=0$. Also, by (σ,δ)-compatibility, equation (1) implies $m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-1})=0$, because $m_pa_q=m_{p-1}a_q=0$. Thus $m_pa_{q-1}=0$.

Summarizing at this point, we have

(α) $$m_pa_q=m_{p-1}a_q=m_pa_{q-1}=0$$

Now, multiplying equation (2) on the right hand by a_q, we get

(2′) $$m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-2})a_q+m_{p-1}\sigma^{p-1}(a_{q-1})a_q+m_pf^p_{p-1}(a_{q-1})a_q+m_{p-2}\sigma^{p-2}(a_q)a_q +m_{p-1}f^{p-1}_{p-2}(a_q)a_q+m_pf^p_{p-2}(a_q)a_q=0,$$

With the same manner as above, equation (2′) gives $m_{p-2}\sigma^{p-2}(a_q)a_q=0$ and thus $m_{p-2}a_q=0$ (β). Also, multiplying equation (2) on the right hand by a_{q-1}, we get

(2″) $$m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-2})a_{q-1}+m_{p-1}\sigma^{p-1}(a_{q-1})a_{q-1}+m_pf^p_{p-1}(a_{q-1})a_{q-1} +m_{p-2}\sigma^{p-2}(a_q)a_{q-1}+m_{p-1}f^{p-1}_{p-2}(a_q)a_{q-1}+m_pf^p_{p-2}(a_q)a_{q-1}=0$$

Equations (α) and (β) implies

$$0=m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-2})a_{q-1}=m_pf^p_{p-1}(a_{q-1})a_{q-1}=m_{p-2}\sigma^{p-2}(a_q)a_{q-1}$$

$$= m_{p-1}f_{p-2}^{p-1}(a_q)a_{q-1} = m_p f_{p-2}^{p}(a_q)a_{q-1}$$

Hence, equation $(2'')$ gives $m_{p-1}\sigma^{p-1}(a_{q-1})a_{q-1} = 0$ and by Lemma 2.12, we get $m_{p-1}a_{q-1} = 0$ (γ). Now, by equations (α),(β) and (γ), we get $m_{p-1}\sigma^{p-1}(a_{q-1}) = m_p f_{p-1}^{p}(a_{q-1}) = m_{p-2}\sigma^{p-2}(a_q) = m_{p-1}f_{p-2}^{p-1}(a_q) = m_p f_{p-2}^{p}(a_q) = 0$. Therefore equation (2) implies $m_p\sigma^p(a_{q-2}) = 0$, so that $m_p a_{q-2} = 0$.

Summarizing at this point, we have $m_i a_j = 0$ with $i + j \in \{p+q, p+q-1, p+q-2\}$. Continuing this procedure yields $m_i a_j = 0$ for all i, j. □

Lemma 2.12. *Let M_R be an (σ,δ)-compatible module, if $ma^2 = 0$ implies $ma = 0$ for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$. Then*

(**1**) *$m\sigma(a)a = 0$ implies $ma = m\sigma(a) = 0$.*
(**2**) *$ma\sigma(a) = 0$ implies $ma = m\sigma(a) = 0$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

According to Lee and Zhou [15], a module M_R is called *σ-reduced*, if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$. We have

(**1**) $ma = 0$ implies $mR \cap Ma = 0$.
(**2**) $ma = 0$ if and only if $m\sigma(a) = 0$.

The module M_R is called reduced if M_R is id_R-reduced.

Lemma 2.13 ([15, Lemma 1.2])**.** *The following are equivalent for a module M_R:*

(**1**) *M_R is σ-reduced.*
(**2**) *The following three conditions hold: For any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$,*
  (**a**) *$ma = 0$ implies $mRa = mR\sigma(a) = 0$.*
  (**b**) *$ma\sigma(a) = 0$ implies $ma = 0$.*
  (**c**) *$ma^2 = 0$ implies $ma = 0$.*

By Lemma 2.13, a module M_R is reduced if and only if it is semicommutative with $ma^2 = 0$ implies $ma = 0$ for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$.

Corollary 2.14 ([1, Theorem 2.19])**.** *Every (σ,δ)-compatible and reduced module is (σ,δ)-skew Armendariz.*

Proof. Clearly from Proposition 2.11(b). □

Let M_R be a module and (σ,δ) a quasi derivation of R. We say that M_R satisfies the condition $(*)$, if for any $m(x) \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x) \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]$, $m(x)f(x) = 0$ implies $m(x)Rf(x) = 0$. A module M_R which satisfies the condition $(*)$ is semicommutative. But the converse is not true, by the next example.

Example 2.15. *Take the ring $R = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ with (σ,δ) as considered in Example 2.6. Since R is commutative then the module R_R is semicommutative. However, it does not satisfy the condition $(*)$. For $p(x) = (1,0)x$ and $q(x) = (1,1) + (1,0)x \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]$. We have $p(x)q(x) = 0$, but $p(x)(1,0)q(x) = (1,0) + (1,0)x \neq 0$. Thus $p(x)Rq(x) \neq 0$.*

Theorem 2.16. *If a module M_R is (σ,δ)-compatible and reduced, then it satisfies the condition $(*)$.*

Proof. Let $m(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{q} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]$, such that $m(x)f(x)=0$. By Proposition 2.11(b) and semicommutativity of M_R, we have $m_i R a_j = 0$ for all i and j. Moreover, compatibility implies $m_i f_k^{\ell}(Ra_j)=0$ for all i,j,k,ℓ. Therefore $m(x)Rf(x)=0$. □

Since the ring $R=\mathbb{Z}_2\oplus\mathbb{Z}_2$ is reduced, then from Example 2.15, we can see that the condition "(σ,δ)-compatible" in Theorem 2.16 is not superfluous.

Proposition 2.17. *Let M_R be an (σ,δ)-compatible module which satisfies $(*)$. Suppose that for any $m(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{q} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]\setminus\{0\}$, $m(x)f(x)=0$. Then $m_i a_q^{p+1}=0$ for all $i=0,1,\cdots,p$.*

Proof. Let $m(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{q} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]\setminus\{0\}$, such that $m(x)f(x)=0$. We can suppose that $a_q\neq 0$. From $m(x)f(x)=0$, we get $m_p\sigma^p(a_q)=0$. Since M_R is (σ,δ)-compatible, we have $m_p a_q=0$ which implies $m_p x^p a_q=0$. Since $m(x)f(x)=0$ implies $m(x)a_q f(x)=0$. Then

$$0=(m_px^p+m_{p-1}x^{p-1}+\cdots+m_1x+m_0)(a_q^2x^q+a_qa_{q-1}x^{q-1}+\cdots+a_qa_1x+a_qa_0)$$

$$=(m_{p-1}x^{p-1}+\cdots+m_1x+m_0)(a_q^2x^q+a_qa_{q-1}x^{q-1}+\cdots+a_qa_1x+a_qa_0).$$

If we put $f'(x)=a_qf(x)$ and $m'(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} m_i x^i$ then we get $m_{p-1}a_q^2=0$. Continuing this procedure yields $m_i a_q^{p+1-i}=0$ for all $i=0,1,\cdots,p$. Consequently $m_i a_q^{p+1}=0$ for all $i=0,1,\cdots,p$. □

Corollary 2.18. *Let M_R be an (σ,δ)-compatible module over a reduced ring R. If M_R satisfies $(*)$, then it is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy.*

Proof. Let $m(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{p} m_i x^i \in M[x;\sigma,\delta]$ and $f(x)=\sum_{j=0}^{q} a_j x^j \in R[x;\sigma,\delta]\setminus\{0\}$, such that $m(x)f(x)=0$. We can suppose that $a_q\neq 0$. By Proposition 2.17, we have $m_i a_q^{p+1}=0$ for all $i=0,1,\cdots,p$. Since M_R is (σ,δ)-compatible, we get $m_i x^i a_q^{p+1}=m_i\sum_{\ell=0}^{i} f_\ell^i(a_q^{p+1})x^\ell=0$ for all i. Hence $m(x)a_q^{p+1}=0$ where $a_q^{p+1}\neq 0$, because R is reduced. Consequently M_R is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy. □

Example 2.19. *Consider a ring of polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}_2$, $R=\mathbb{Z}_2[x]$. Let $\sigma\colon R\to R$ be an endomorphism defined by $\sigma(f(x))=f(0)$. Then*

(**1**) *R is not σ-compatible. Let $f=\overline{1}+x$, $g=x\in R$, we have $fg=(\overline{1}+x)x\neq 0$, however $f\sigma(g)=(\overline{1}+x)\sigma(x)=0$.*

(**2**) *R is σ-skew Armendariz* [10, Example 5].

From Example 2.19, we see that the ring $R=\mathbb{Z}_2[x]$ is σ-skew McCoy because it is σ-skew Armendariz, but it is not σ-compatible. Thus the (σ,δ)-compatibility condition is not essential to obtain (σ,δ)-skew McCoyness.

Example 2.20 ([5, Example 2.5])**.** *Let R be a ring, σ an endomorphism of R and δ be a σ-derivation of R. Suppose that R is σ-rigid. Consider the ring*

$$V_3(R) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ 0 & a & b \\ 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \mid a,b,c \in R \right\}.$$

The ring $V_3(R)$ is $(\overline{\sigma},\overline{\delta})$-skew McCoy, reduced and $(\overline{\sigma},\overline{\delta})$-compatible, and by Theorem 2.16, it satisfies the condition $(*)$.

3. (σ,δ)-skew McCoyness of some matrix extensions

For a nonnegative integer $n \geq 2$, let R be a ring and M a right R-module. Consider

$$S_n(R) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & a_{12} & a_{13} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ 0 & a & a_{23} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ 0 & 0 & a & \dots & a_{3n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a \end{pmatrix} \mid a, a_{ij} \in R \right\}$$

and

$$S_n(M) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} m & m_{12} & m_{13} & \dots & m_{1n} \\ 0 & m & m_{23} & \dots & m_{2n} \\ 0 & 0 & m & \dots & m_{3n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m \end{pmatrix} \mid m, m_{ij} \in M \right\}$$

Clearly, $S_n(M)$ is a right $S_n(R)$-module under the usual matrix addition operation and the following scalar product operation. For $U = (u_{ij}) \in S_n(M)$ and $A = (a_{ij}) \in S_n(R), UA = (m_{ij}) \in S_n(M)$ with $m_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} u_{ik}a_{kj}$ for all i,j. A quasi derivation (σ,δ) of R can be extended to a quasi derivation $(\overline{\sigma},\overline{\delta})$ of $S_n(R)$ as follows: $\overline{\sigma}((a_{ij})) = (\sigma(a_{ij}))$ and $\overline{\delta}((a_{ij})) = (\delta(a_{ij}))$. We can easily verify that $\overline{\delta}$ is a $\overline{\sigma}$-derivation of $S_n(R)$.

Theorem 3.1. *A module M_R is (σ,δ)-skew McCoy if and only if $S_n(M)$ is $(\overline{\sigma},\overline{\delta})$-skew McCoy as an $S_n(R)$-module for any nonnegative integer $n \geq 2$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to [4, Theorem 14]. □

Now, for $n \geq 2$. Consider

$$V_n(R) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \dots & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a_0 & a_1 & \dots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a_0 \end{pmatrix} \mid a_0, a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_{n-1} \in R \right\}$$

and

$$V_n(M) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & m_3 & \dots & m_{n-1} \\ 0 & m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & \dots & m_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & m_0 & m_1 & \dots & m_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m_0 \end{pmatrix} \mid m_0, m_1, m_2, \cdots, m_{n-1} \in M \right\}$$

With the same method as above, $V_n(M)$ is a right $V_n(R)$-module, and a quasi derivation (σ, δ) of R can be extended to a quasi derivation $(\overline{\sigma}, \overline{\delta})$ of $V_n(R)$. Note that $V_n(M) \cong M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ where $M[x](x^n)$ is a submodule of $M[x]$ generated by x^n and $V_n(R) \cong R[x]/(x^n)$ where (x^n) is an ideal of $R[x]$ generated by x^n.

Proposition 3.2. *A module M_R is (σ, δ)-skew McCoy if and only if $V_n(M)$ is $(\overline{\sigma}, \overline{\delta})$-skew McCoy as an $V_n(R)$-module for any nonnegative integer $n \geq 2$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [4, Theorem 14] or [8, Proposition 2.27]. □

Corollary 3.3. *For a nonnegative integer $n \geq 2$, we have:*

(**1**) *M_R is (σ, δ)-skew McCoy if and only if $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $(\overline{\sigma}, \overline{\delta})$-skew McCoy.*

(**2**) *R is (σ, δ)-skew McCoy if and only if $R[x]/(x^n)$ is $(\overline{\sigma}, \overline{\delta})$-skew McCoy.*

(**3**) *R is McCoy if and only if $R[x]/(x^n)$ is McCoy.*

In the next, we define *skew triangular matrix modules* $V_n(M, \sigma)$, based on the definition of skew triangular matrix rings $V_n(R, \sigma)$ given by Isfahani [12]. Let σ be an endomorphism of a ring R and M_R a right R-module. For $n \geq 2$. Consider

$$V_n(R, \sigma) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \dots & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a_0 & a_1 & \dots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a_0 \end{pmatrix} \mid a_0, a_2, \cdots, a_{n-1} \in R \right\}$$

and

$$V_n(M, \sigma) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & m_3 & \dots & m_{n-1} \\ 0 & m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & \dots & m_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & m_0 & m_1 & \dots & m_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m_0 \end{pmatrix} \mid m_0, m_2, \cdots, m_{n-1} \in M \right\}$$

Clearly $V_n(M,\sigma)$ is a right $V_n(R,\sigma)$-module under the usual matrix addition operation and the following scalar product operation.

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & m_3 & \dots & m_{n-1} \\ 0 & m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & \dots & m_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & m_0 & m_1 & \dots & m_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m_0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \dots & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a_0 & a_1 & \dots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a_0 \end{pmatrix} =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & \dots & c_{n-1} \\ 0 & c_0 & c_1 & c_2 & \dots & c_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & c_0 & c_1 & \dots & c_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & c_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & c_0 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where}$$

$c_i = m_0\sigma^0(a_i) + m_1\sigma^1(a_{i-1}) + m_2\sigma^2(a_{i-2}) + \cdots + m_i\sigma^i(a_0)$ for each $0 \le i \le n-1$.

We denote elements of $V_n(R,\sigma)$ by $(a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_{n-1})$ and elements of $V_n(M,\sigma)$ by $(m_0, m_1, \cdots, m_{n-1})$. There is a ring isomorphism $\varphi\colon R[x;\sigma]/(x^n) \to V_n(R,\sigma)$ given by $\varphi(a_0+a_1x+a_2x^2+\cdots+a_{n-1}x^{n-1}+(x^n)) = (a_0, a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_{n-1})$, and an abelian group isomorphism $\phi\colon M[x,\sigma]/M[x,\sigma](x^n) \to V_n(M,\sigma)$ given by $\phi(m_0+m_1x+m_2x^2+\cdots+m_{n-1}x^{n-1}+(x^n)) = (m_0, m_1, m_2, \cdots, m_{n-1})$ such that

$$\phi(N(x)A(x)) = \phi(N(x))\varphi(A(x))$$

for any $N(x) = m_0+m_1x+m_2x^2+\cdots+m_{n-1}x^{n-1}+(x^n) \in M[x,\sigma]/M[x,\sigma](x^n)$ and $A(x) = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + (x^n) \in R[x;\sigma]/(x^n)$. The endomorphism σ of R can be extended to $V_n(R,\sigma)$ and $R[x;\sigma]$, and we will denote it in both cases by $\overline{\sigma}$.

Theorem 3.4. *A module M_R is σ-skew McCoy if and only if $V_n(M,\sigma)$ is $\overline{\sigma}$-skew McCoy as an $V_n(R,\sigma)$-module for any nonnegative integer $n \ge 2$.*

Proof. We shall adapt the proof of [4, Theorem 14] to this situation. Note that $V_n(R,\sigma)[x,\overline{\sigma}] \cong V_n(R[x,\sigma],\overline{\sigma})$ and $V_n(M,\sigma)[x,\overline{\sigma}] \cong V_n(M[x,\sigma],\overline{\sigma})$. We only prove when $n = 2$, because other cases can be proved with the same manner. Suppose that M_R is σ-skew McCoy. Let $0 \ne m(x) \in V_2(M,\sigma)[x,\overline{\sigma}]$ and $0 \ne f(x) \in V_2(R,\sigma)[x,\overline{\sigma}]$ such that $m(x)f(x) = 0$, where

$$m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} \begin{pmatrix} m_{11}^{(i)} & m_{12}^{(i)} \\ 0 & m_{11}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} x^i = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_{11}^{(i)}x^i & \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_{12}^{(i)}x^i \\ 0 & \sum_{i=0}^{p} m_{11}^{(i)}x^i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} \\ 0 & \alpha_{11} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{q} \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^{(j)} & a_{12}^{(j)} \\ 0 & a_{11}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix} x^j = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{j=0}^{q} a_{11}^{(j)}x^j & \sum_{j=0}^{q} a_{12}^{(j)}x^j \\ 0 & \sum_{j=0}^{q} a_{11}^{(j)}x^j \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} \\ 0 & \beta_{11} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} \\ 0 & \alpha_{11} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} \\ 0 & \beta_{11} \end{pmatrix} = 0$, which gives $\alpha_{11}\beta_{11} = 0$ and $\alpha_{11}\beta_{12} + \alpha_{12}\overline{\sigma}(\beta_{11}) = 0$ in $M[x;\sigma]$. If $\alpha_{11} \neq 0$, then there exists $0 \neq \beta \in \{\beta_{11}, \beta_{12}\}$ such that $\alpha_{11}\beta = 0$. Since M_R is σ-skew McCoy then there exists $0 \neq c \in R$ which satisfies $\alpha_{11}c = 0$, thus $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} \\ 0 & \alpha_{11} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & c \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha_{11}c \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0$. If $\alpha_{11} = 0$ then $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & c \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0$, for any $0 \neq c \in R$. Therefore, $V_2(M,\sigma)$ is $\overline{\sigma}$-skew McCoy.

Conversely, suppose that $V_2(M,\sigma)$ is an $\overline{\sigma}$-skew McCoy module. Let $0 \neq m(x) = m_0 + m_1x + \cdots + m_px^p \in M[x;\sigma]$ and $0 \neq f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_qx^q \in R[x;\sigma]$, such that $m(x)f(x) = 0$. Then $\begin{pmatrix} m(x) & 0 \\ 0 & m(x) \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} f(x) & 0 \\ 0 & f(x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} m(x)f(x) & 0 \\ 0 & m(x)f(x) \end{pmatrix} = 0$, so there exists $0 \neq \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in V_2(R,\sigma)$ such that $\begin{pmatrix} m(x) & 0 \\ 0 & m(x) \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} = 0$, because $V_2(M,\sigma)$ is $\overline{\sigma}$-skew McCoy. Thus $m(x)a = m(x)b = 0$, where $a \neq 0$ or $b \neq 0$. Therefore, M_R is σ-skew McCoy. □

Corollary 3.5. *For a nonnegative integer $n \geq 2$, we have:*

(**1**) *M_R is σ-skew McCoy if and only if $M[x;\sigma]/M[x;\sigma](x^n)$ is $\overline{\sigma}$-skew McCoy.*

(**2**) *R is σ-skew McCoy if and only if $R[x;\sigma]/(x^n)$ is $\overline{\sigma}$-skew McCoy.*

(**3**) *M_R is McCoy if and only if $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is McCoy.*

(**4**) *R is McCoy if and only if $R[x]/(x^n)$ is McCoy.*

References

[1] A. Alhevaz and A. Moussavi, *On skew Armendariz and skew quasi-Armendariz modules*, Bull. Iran. Math. Soc. **1** (2012), 55-84.

[2] S. Annin, *Associated primes over skew polynomials rings*, Comm. Algebra **30** (2002), 2511-2528.

[3] S. Annin, *Associated primes over Ore extension rings*, J. Algebra appl. **3** (2004), 193-205.

[4] M. Başer, T. K. Kwak and Y. Lee, *The McCoy condition on skew polynomial rings*, Comm. Algebra **37** (2009), 4026-4037.

[5] L. Ben Yakoub and M. Louzari, *Ore extensions of extended symmetric and reversible rings,* Inter. J. of Algebra **3**, 2009, No.9, 423-433.

[6] A. M. Buhphang and M. B. Rege, *semicommutative modules and Armendariz modules*, Arab J. Math. Sciences **8** (2002), 53-65.

[7] J. Cui and J. Chen, *On McCoy modules*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. **48** (2011), No. 1, 23-33.

[8] J. Cui and J. Chen, *On α-skew McCoy modules*, Turk. J. Math. **36** (2012), 217-229.

[9] E. Hashemi, *Extensions of Baer and quasi-Baer modules*, Bull. of the Iran. Math. Soc. **37** (2011), No. 1, 1-13.

[10] C. Y. Hong, N. K. Kim and T. K. Kwak,*On Skew Armendariz Rings,* Comm. Algebra **31**(1) (2003), 103-122.

[11] N.H. McCoy, *Annihilators in polynomial rings*, Amer. math. monthly **64** (1957), 28-29.
[12] A. R. Nasr-Isfahani, *On Skew Triangular Matrix Rings*, Comm. Algebra **39** (2011), 4461-4469
[13] N. K. Kim and Y. Lee, *Armendariz rings and reduced rings*, J. Algebra **223** (2000), 477-488.
[14] T. Y. Lam, A. Leroy and J. Matczuk, *Primeness, semiprimeness and the prime radical of Ore extensions*, Comm. Algebra **25** (8) (1997), 2459-2506.
[15] T. K. Lee and Y. Lee, *Reduced Modules*, Rings, modules, algebras and abelian groups, 365-377, Lecture Notes in Pure and App. Math. 236 Dekker, New york, (2004).
[16] A. Leroyy and J. Matczuk, *On induced modules over Ore extensions*, Comm. Algebra **32**(7) (2004), 2743-2766.
[17] C. P. Zhang and J. L. Chen, *σ-skew Armendariz modules and σ-semicommutative modules*, Taiwanese J. Math. **12**(2) (2008), 473-486.
[18] R. Zhao and Z. Liu, *Extensions of McCoy Rings*, Algebra Colloq. **16** 3 (2009), 495-502.

Depertment of Mathematics, Faculty of sciences, Abdelmalek Essaadi University, BP. 2121 Tetouan, Morocco
E-mail address: mlouzari@yahoo.com

Depertment of Mathematics, Faculty of sciences, Abdelmalek Essaadi University, BP. 2121 Tetouan, Morocco
E-mail address: benyakoub@hotmail.com